

Michael J. Grant Campus

# Academic Assembly

## October 3, 2018 Meeting Minutes

1. Alexander Kasiukov called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.
2. The minutes of May 8, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously.
3. Chair's Report (Alexander Kasiukov) – see [http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2018-10-02/index.html#Grant-Campus-Academic-Assembly](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2018-10-02/index.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22Grant-Campus-Academic-Assembly)
4. Election of a representative on the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to replace Gregory Ryan (one vacancy, electing for 2018-2020 two year term) Jason Cascone elected
5. Grant Campus Curriculum Committee:
	1. Resolution 2018-09-[01] Approving the ENG011 - Enhanced Writing Skills New Course Proposal Approved [49-2-2]
	2. Resolution 2018-09-[02] Approving the ENG100 - Enhanced Freshman Composition New Course Proposal Approved [21-2-1]
6. Resolutions from the College-wide Curriculum Committee:
	* 1. Resolution 2018-09-[03] Approving the BIO130 - Anatomy and Physiology I Course Revision Proposal - Approved [49-2-3]
		2. Resolution 2018-09-[04] Approving the A.A. Communication Studies Curriculum Revision Proposal – Approved [51-1-2]
7. Update on the Next Strategic Plan Development (Kaliah Greene) – from OPIE
	1. The new strategic plan is entitled, “Honoring our Past, Forging Our Future” for 2020-2027.
	2. OPIE would like to hear from all College stakeholders and will be conducting focus groups to obtain thoughts, concerns and observations. Focus groups are scheduled for 10/22-10/25 from 11-12 but flexibility will be offered for anyone interested in participating, contact OPIE.
	3. Also, if you are willing to have a focus group with your class please contact OPIE.
	4. A microsite has been established and the link will be shared with Alexander Kasiukov.
8. Campus Update (James Keane) - Recap of College enrollment numbers, budgetary concerns, physical campus updates
9. Hardship Fund (Gregory Ryan) - developed to help students un need due to unique circumstances. Donations can be sent to Janet Fenton.
10. Holistic Professor Program (Gregory Ryan) – applications for Ft faculty will be accepted through the end of the week (10/5)
11. For the Good of the Assembly
12. Tri-Campus Task Force Update (Ginny Horan); see the latest draft of the [Constitution of the Governance Coordinating Body](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2018-10-02/governance-coordinating-body-constitution-2018-09-25.docx) :
	1. Ginny Horan (member of the Task Force)
		1. Please read the GCB Constitution before the next Assembly of you have not already done so. Faculty are very detached from Governance and need to become more involved.
		2. The Task Force is done. It is now up to the Faculty and Governance to fine tune or change or whatever they see fit.
	2. Concerns from Marc Fellenz
		1. Professor Fellenz appreciated that the Task Force had to step into a difficult situation, an stressed that his comments were not intended to criticize either Ginny or the other members of the group;
		2. The document is very heavy on issues regarding mediation and reaching consensus, validating of feelings of each campus;
		3. Fundamental objective of why we have a college-wide governance body is to strengthen the faculty voice, provide a unified faculty voice with shared governance – those things that seems to get lost in negotiations.
		4. Interesting aspects of the Task Force’s proposal:
			1. What brought us to the crisis was one campus deciding that it was not going to participate any longer – there needs to be a non-secession clause, no other college-wide committee can operate under that threat – no effective College committee can work that way. You stay in the room, make the argument, take the vote and move on.
			2. Language that the college-wide coordinating body is only to operate when it is authorized by the 3 bodies. That seems wrong to hold the body hostage to appeasing all 3 campuses. Practically it seems to undermine a really important function of this college-wide body – there should be some leadership qualities to this body. It should bring issues to the attention of the campuses so that they can be discussed on a campus committee and generate some consensus. This assume that there will be consensus that can be brought to this council and I don’t see how that can operate.
	3. Ginny Horan
		1. That wasn’t the intent of the Task Force. There were 2 completely disparate opinions of everything on the Task Force. Ginny’s take from the language was to get faculty involved in the process through the governance chair. Not to sit back and allowed someone else to take charge.
		2. Ginny did not realize that the language could be taken in that way and therefore the language needs to be clearer.
		3. The 2 different interpretations of the issues that contributed to the original breakdown of the college-wide governance body and therefore, influenced the language that the Task Force came up with.
		4. The non-secession clause was the biggest issue that was before the Task Force. Every member of the Task Force worked very hard to be as neutral as possible.
		5. The Task Force felt that they had addressed the non-secession clause with all of the safe-guards and steps for resolution that they put in the document. But it was very difficult to outright prohibit secession and then get any type of agreement within the Task Force.
		6. Dawn Tracy-Hanley commented that she thinks the clause needs to in there. Ginny’s response: the feeling was that the members that want the secession clause feel it worked because they invoked it and here we are talking about everything. Therefore they want the right reserved to secede.
		7. Task Force thought that by stressing consensus that, even though it’s long and messy, people get involved. The history with anything related to tri-campus voting is that 2 gang-upon one and hold up everything.
		8. Comment from an assembly member (Elisa Mancuso?) her experience that the faculty places what’s best for the students first and the college. Ginny: Let’s find the appropriate section and re-vamp it.
	4. Marc Fellenz:
		1. The history of the consensus language was to try to prevent 2 campuses from ganging up on one, but for that to work everyone at the table has to understand their role at working towards consensus. That takes work and you have to stay in the group for that to happen and if you don’t succeed, you can’t bow out and pass a resolution that destroys the shared governance body. Then the consensus building can’t happen.
		2. In theory it can work, but in practice it doesn’t always. That’s why we may have to rethink that model of consensus as opposed to leadership, having arguments and taking a vote.
	5. Ginny Horan
		1. Other Changes related to that – we tried to make sure that there was more representation – which speaks to a problem we have everywhere. The same people are on these 3 different committees and their role gives them 3 spots on governance. Or when senior faculty don’t volunteer and committees have mostly junior faculty that don’t the experience or security to stand up for something or speak openly and honestly then things break. The Task Force attempted to make changes to ensure a wide-range of people are there.
		2. Maybe we didn’t address things the way they should be addressed and maybe it’s back to the drawing board. The Task Force’s charge was not very clear.
	6. Alexander Kasiukov
		1. The document you see is just a draft. All of the solutions should come from the floor. The governance chair are not the ones in charge of this process – the work should be done by our members. The idea of consensus puts too much trust in the nature of people. The system must fail in graceful way and not destroy the whole body – the issue should fail, it should be compartmentalized.
	7. Ginny Horan
		1. Article 4 tried to deal with whoever had the issue needed to stay involved.
		2. There are also built-in annual assessments and an assessment process to help the body deal with problems and issues and heal. The assessment is to be conducted by each campus about the central governance body.
	8. Discussion tabled and to be continued at the next meeting.
13. Motion to Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 pm.